

# ARTHAŚĀSTRA-VYĀKHYĀ JAYAMAṄGALĀ

अर्थशास्त्रव्याख्या - जयमङ्गला

*EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION*

BY

G. HARIHARA SASTRI



KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
MYLAPORE, MADRAS

1958

**Price: Rupees Three**

## INTRODUCTION

*Jayamaṅgalā*, the work edited here, is an important commentary on the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya. The commentator says at the outset that even as Kauṭalya composed the *Arthaśāstra* summarising the views of his predecessors, he has written his commentary embodying in it all that was found good in other commentaries on the work<sup>1</sup>. This shows that at the time of the commentator the *Arthaśāstra* was widely read and had several commentaries written on it. However during the centuries that followed, studies on the *Arthaśāstra* gradually declined, so much so that commentators like Mallinātha had to explain the *Artha* topics in Kāvya without direct reference to their source, and what is left at the present time is only a few manuscripts of the text and broken fragments of some commentaries, in a corner of India, viz., Kerala. The text of Kauṭalya is generally terse and not easily understood. Therefore the traditional commentaries, however fragmentary they be, are of great value for a correct interpretation of the text. Among the commentaries so far discovered *Pratīpadapañcikā* of Bhaṭṭa-svāmin (available for II. 8-36), *Nayacandrikā* of Mādhava Yajvan (available for VII. 7-11 and VII. 15—XII. 4) and a Tamil-Malayalam commentary (available for I-VII) were made use of by Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri for his edition of the *Arthaśāstra* which he published with his own Sanskrit commentary in the *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* (Nos. 79, 80, 82). Later a fragment of another commentary containing the first two Adhikaraṇas and the first Adhyāya of the third Adhikaraṇa was secured by the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, from the Paliyam family, Cochin, Kerala State. A paper transcript in Devanagari was made of this manuscript for the library (R. 5208) and the original was returned to the owner. Dr. Ganapati Sastri had another transcript made for himself but it reached him too late for use in his edition of the *Arthaśāstra*.

- 
1. पूर्वमतानि यथेदं संगृह्यैकं चकार कौटल्यः ।  
टीकान्तराणि हृष्ट्वा सद्ब्याख्यानं समुद्धृत्य ॥  
क्रियते तथा मयापि त्यक्त्वा च ग्रन्थविस्तरं पूर्णम् ।  
बालहिता टीकेयम् । (p. 1)

On fuller examination this manuscript appeared to contain fragments of two different commentaries. The text covering the first Adhikaraṇa (Book I) is called *Jayamaṅgalā*<sup>1</sup> (hereafter referred to as *Jaya*) and the remaining portion, *Cāṇakyaṭīkā*. The name of the author of the *Jaya* is not known, while the *Cāṇakyaṭīkā* is mentioned as the work of Bhikṣuprabhamati<sup>2</sup> and from the corrupt state of the manuscript it is not possible to ascertain whether it is a continuation of the *Jaya*. I have not so far been able to trace in literature any reference to the *Jaya* fragment, but the *Cāṇakyaṭīkā* is found quoted by name in the *Ṭīkāsarvasva*, commentary on the *Amarakośa* by Sarvānanda (1159 A.D.), and the quotations could be verified in the manuscript.<sup>3</sup> There are several gaps, errors and corrupt passages in the manuscript and they are tolerably less in the *Jaya* fragment than in the other. From the style and language the commentary seems to be ancient. It throws light on several unexplained words and passages in Kauṭaliya and often provides valuable variant readings. I therefore thought of bringing out an edition of it even though it was fragmentary. The only original manuscript which would have been of use to me in deciphering the corrupt passages was known to have been sent to Europe by the owner.<sup>4</sup>

1. This is evident from the colophon of the first Adhikaraṇa:

‘समाप्तं चेदं कौटलीयार्थशास्त्रसद्व्याख्यानटीकायां जयमङ्गलायां विनयाधिकारिकं प्रथममधिकरणम्’ (p. 76)

2. The ending colophon of the third Adhyāya runs thus:

‘इति भिक्षुप्रभमतिकृतायां चाणक्यटीकायाम् आभ्यक्ष्ये दुर्गविधानं तृतीयं प्रकरणम् । तृतीयभाष्यायः’ (p. 107, Ms. with the editor).

3. (i) Cf. ‘द्वीपिव्याघ्रयोरल्पमहत्तया भेदः’ (Cāṇakyaṭīkā on Kupyādhyaṅga, II. 17, p. 185 of Ms. with the editor) and ‘द्वीपिव्याघ्रयोरल्पमहत्तया भेदः’ इति चाणक्यटीकाकृतोक्तम् । (Ṭīkāsarvasva, II. 5.1, TSS 43, p. 214).

(ii) Cf. ‘कुप्यमसारं द्रव्यम्’ (Ibid. Ms. p. 183) and ‘कुप्याध्यक्षप्रचारे लोहवर्गश्चर्मवर्गो विषादिवर्गश्च दर्शितः, ‘कुप्यमसारं द्रव्य’मिति तद्दीकाकृतम्,’ (Ibid. II. 9.22, TSS No. 51. p. 231)

(iii) रोहितो वातहरिणः, अश्वमृग इत्यन्ये, एणः स्वल्पमृगः, (Ibid. on Koṣṭhāgārādhyakṣa, II. 15, Ms. p. 179) and

एणः स्वल्पमृगः सुनयनः । .....रोहितो घोटकरूपोऽश्वमृगः । तथा च ‘रोहितोऽश्वमृग’ इति कोष्ठाध्यक्षप्रचारटीका । (Ibid. II. 5. 10, TSS No. 43, p. 224.)

4. See M. Winternitz, “Zwei neue Arthasāstra manuskripte” and IHQ. IV. 397: ‘Mr. Anujan Achan of Santiniketan discovered two

The text edited is based on a single transcript in my possession, copied by me from the paper transcript of Dr. Ganapati Sastri. The commentary is precise and clear; it discusses the correctness and propriety of terms according to Pāṇini's rules,<sup>1</sup> narrates stories to explain legendary allusions and criticises other commentators when it differs from them.<sup>2</sup> It may be noted here that some of the stories relating to the kings who are said to have lost their lives and kingdoms as a result of unrestrained passion are not traceable in the extant redactions of the Purāṇas and Itihāsas (cf. pp. 18-21). The commentary quotes from the *Mahābhārata*, *Kāmaśāstra* of Vātsyāyana (p. 6), *Tantrākhyāyikā* (p. 16) and other ancient works and mentions *Ṣaṣṭitantra*, the work of Sāṅkhya<sup>3</sup> (p. 10).

Commentaries called *Jayamaṅgalā* are known for the *Nīlisāra* of Kāmandaka, *Kāmaśāstra* of Vātsyāyana, *Bhaṭṭikāvya* and *Sāṅkhyakārikā*. The present commentary *Jayamaṅgalā* on the *Arthaśāstra* adds one more to the list. The identity of the name of the work would suggest identity of authorship. It may also be noted here that the invocatory stanzas of these commentaries resemble one another,

---

manuscripts of the *Arthaśāstra* in his uncle's library in Cochin (Nos. 916 and 647) and sent them to Prof. Winternitz. Manuscript No. 916 contains a full commentary on the first two Adhikaraṇas and the first Adhyāya of the third Adhikaraṇa of the Kauṭaliya *Arthaśāstra*. The manuscript is written in Malayalam script and is incorrect and hardly legible. Neither the name of the commentary nor that of the commentator is to be found in the colophons; on the last page however, there are a few unconnected lines belonging to the commentary on the last portion of VII, 6 and the initial words of the *Nayacandrikā*.<sup>7</sup> This description tallies with the manuscript in my possession and also the paper transcript (R. 5208) in the Govt. Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.

1. See for instance, दुर्गलभोपायः । लभ इत्यपप्रयोगः, “उपसर्गात् खल्वञ्जोः” इति नियमात् । (p. 7). It may be noted that all printed texts read here दुर्गलभोपायः ।

2. केचित् कृषिपाशुपाल्ये इति समस्य पठन्ति । तत्र च प्रयोजनम् इतरेतरापेक्षत्वम् । वणिज्यायाम् पृथक्करणं निरपेक्षत्वाद् इत्याहुः । तदयुक्तम् । सर्वेषां परस्परार्थकरणस्य अप्रतिषिद्धत्वात् । (p. 13).

3. See also JOR. III. 107-11.



and all of them pay obeisance to the same Omniscient One denoted by the word *Sarva*id, *Sakalavedin*, or *Lokottara-vā(ṛc)din*.<sup>1</sup>

Kāmandaka in his *Nitisāra* (Ed. TSS 14) as stated in his introduction, summarises the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya; and in doing so, he leaves out Books II, III, IV and XV of the original. From this, it follows that the topics commented on in the first Adhikaraṇa of the *Jaya* on the *Arthaśāstra* are also found in the *Jaya* on Kāmandaka, consistent with the scope of its abridgement. On examination, it is seen that not only the topics, but words, ideas, explanations and illustrations are also identical in them. A few passages are shown below side by side for verification:

*Jaya on the Arthaśāstra*

*Jaya on Kāmandaka*

चतस्र इति — यथोपवर्णितपूर्वा- यथोपवर्णितपूर्वाचार्यमतसंभवेऽपि  
चार्यमतसंभवेऽपि परस्परं विसदृशव्या- परस्परं विसदृशफलसिद्धयर्थं चतस्र-  
पारत्वाद् विसदृशरूपत्वाद् विसदृश- ध्वेव लोको व्यवस्थितः । (p. 27)  
फलत्वात् चतस्र एव । (p. 9)

1. पूर्वमतानि यथेदं संगृह्यैकं चकार कौटल्यः ।  
टीकान्तराणि दृष्ट्वा सद्व्याख्यानं समुद्धृत्य ॥  
क्रियते तथा मयापि त्यक्त्वा च ग्रन्थविस्तरं पूर्णम् ।  
बालहिता टीकेयं दुर्ज्ञेयं यद् वितत्य सर्वमिदम् ? (प्रणम्य सर्वविदम्) ॥  
(p. 1)  
कामन्दकीये किल नीतिशास्त्रे प्रायेण नास्मिन् सुगमाः पदार्थाः ।  
तस्माद् विधास्ये जयमङ्गलाख्यां तत्पञ्चिकां सर्वविदं प्रणम्य ॥  
(*Jaya on Kāmandakīya*)  
बात्स्यायनीयं किल कामशालं प्रस्तावितं कैश्चिदिहान्यथैव ।  
तस्माद् विधास्ये जयमङ्गलाख्यां टीकामहं सर्वविदं प्रणम्य ॥  
(*Jaya on Kāmasāstra*)  
प्रणिपत्य सकलवेदिनमतिदुस्तरभर्तृकाव्यसलिलनिधेः ।  
जयमङ्गलेति नाम्ना नौकेव विरच्यते टीका ॥  
(*Jāya on Bhāṭṭikānya*)  
अधिगततत्त्वालोकं लोकोत्तरवा(वे)दिनं प्रणम्य मुनिम् ।  
क्रियते सप्ततिकायाष्टीका जयमङ्गला नाम ॥  
(*Jaya on Sāṅkhyakārikā*)

तद् यथा— अतिदानेन धर्मोऽर्थं पीडयित्वा धर्मान्तरं कामञ्च पीडयति । तपश्च अत्यन्तं सेवितं कामं पीडयित्वा शरीरक्षयाद् धर्मार्थौ बाधते । अर्थोऽपि तादात्विकोऽस्ति य उपादीयमानः ऐलस्येव धर्मकामौ बाधित्वा अर्थमपि बाधते । कामोऽप्यासेव्यमानः शरीर-क्षयादात्मानं पीडयति । (p. 23)

स्वाध्यायः । यस्मिन्नेव वेदे व्रतं चरति स एवाध्येय इति स्वग्रहणम् । ....एतद् वेदब्रह्मचारिण उप-कुर्वाणस्य आ समावर्तनात् । आ मर-णान्तात्तु नैष्ठिकस्य । अयं विशेषः— आचार्यकुले प्राणान्तिकी प्राणा एवान्तोऽवधिर्यस्या विद्यते सा । (p. 11)

शुश्रूषेत्यादि— शुश्रूषा श्रोतुमिच्छा । तस्यां श्रवणम् आसेवा । तस्मिन् सति श्रुतानाम् अर्थानाम् अवधारणं ग्रहणम् । ग्रहीतानां धारणम् अविस्मरणम् । धारितानां विविध-साध्यसाधनस्वरूपज्ञानादिभिर्विवेकज्ञानं विज्ञानम् । विज्ञातानामर्थप्राप्तस्य उपादानम् ऊहः । (p. 15)

लाभे पालने चेति । लाभ-निमित्तं पालननिमित्तं च । 'निमित्तात् कर्मयोगे' इति सप्तमी । लाभो नवो भूतपूर्वः पित्र्यश्चेति । पालनमपि स्वैभ्यः परेभ्यश्चेति द्विविधम् । .....

तद् यथा— अतिदानेन धर्मोऽर्थं हत्वा कामं धर्मान्तरं च हन्ति । तपश्च अत्यन्तसेवितं कामं हत्वा शरीरक्षयाद् धर्मार्थौ हन्ति । तथा अर्थस्तादात्विकोऽप्युपादीयमानः ऐल-स्येव धर्मकामौ हत्वा अर्थमपि हन्ति । कामः पुनरप्यासेव्यमानः.....शरीर-क्षयादात्मानमपि हन्ति । (p. 18)

स्वाध्यायः । यस्मिन् वेदे व्रतं चरति स एवाध्येय इति स्वग्रहणम् । ....एवं तावद् वेदब्रह्मचारिण उपकुर्वाणस्य आ समावर्तनात् । आ मरणान्तात्तु नैष्ठिकस्य । तस्य विशेषमाह— गुरौ आचार्यकुले प्राणा-न्तिकी स्थितिः अवस्थानम् । प्राणा एवान्तोऽवधिरस्या इति विग्रहः । (p. 33)

शुश्रूषेत्यादि— श्रवणार्हेषु श्रोतु-मिच्छा शुश्रूषा । तस्यां सत्यां श्रवणम् आसेवा । श्रुतानामर्थानामवधारणं ग्रहणम् । धारणं ग्रहीतानाम् अवि-स्मरणम् । धारितेष्वर्थेषु विविधसाध्य-साधनस्वरूपविवेकज्ञानम् अर्थविज्ञान-मिति धारणानन्तरं द्रष्टव्यम् । श्लोका-नुरोधात् तत्र न पठितम् । ज्ञातेष्वर्थ-प्राप्तस्य उल्लिङ्गनम् ऊहः । (p. 53)

उपार्जने पालने च भूमेरिति मुख्यं प्रयोजनम् । 'निमित्तात् कर्मयोगे' इति सप्तमी । भूमिर्मनुष्य-वती । तस्या आजर्नं त्रिविधम्—नवं भूतपूर्वं पित्र्यं च । रक्षणं द्विविधम्— स्वैभ्यः परेभ्यश्च ।

ननु चोभयोरपि पक्षयोर्वर्धनस्य तीर्थप्रतिपादनस्य च असंप्रहात् कथं प्रतिपत्तिः? यथा वक्ष्यति—‘रक्षितवर्धनी, वृद्धस्य तीर्थप्रतिपादनी च’ इति । सत्यम् । किञ्च अस्यैव विशेषनिर्देशोऽयम् । रक्षितवर्धनमप्यार्जनमेव । तीर्थप्रतिपादनमपि गुणवति पुत्रादौ निक्षेपः, अश्वमेधादौ वा विनियोगः । तदपि रक्षणमेव । तस्मादुभयमपि पालनान्तर्भूतमेव द्रष्टव्यम् । (pp. 3-4)

ननु रक्षितवर्धनं वृद्धस्य च तीर्थप्रतिपादनमप्यस्ति । सत्यम् । अस्य द्वयस्यैव विशेषोऽयम् । यतो रक्षितविवर्धनमप्यार्जनमेव । तीर्थप्रतिपादनमपि गुणवति पुत्रे निक्षेपः, अश्वमेधादौ विनियोगो वा, तदुभयमपि सर्वथा रक्षणमेव । (p. 5)

A careful study of the two commentaries tends to show that the author of the *Jaya* on the *Arthaśāstra* also wrote a short commentary on the *Nitisāra* of Kāmandaka to suit that metrical abridgement. The *Jaya* on Kāmandaka is edited with the help of six manuscripts, all obtained from the Kerala country, and it is ascribed there to one Śaṅkarārya in the colophons.

The *Kāmaśāstra* of Vātsyāyana is written on the model of the *Arthaśāstra* in its external set-up and method of treatment. The *śāstra-prayojana* (utility of the science) enunciated in the introductory portion of the *Kāmaśāstra-Jaya* bears close similarity with the corresponding section of the *Arthaśāstra-Jaya*. Similar ideas, passages and illustrations also occur in the *Jaya* on the *Arthaśāstra* and in the *Jaya* on the *Kāmaśāstra*. A few parallels are given to illustrate the point:

*Jaya on Arthaśāstra*

येषामपि शास्त्रविदां केषाञ्चिद् अपनयाद् अनर्थेन योगः स तेषामेवापराधो न शास्त्रस्य । नोद्धकः पश्यतीत्यनेन नोदेतव्यम् । प्रतिपत्त्रपराधाच्च शास्त्रानर्थक्यं सर्व(शास्त्रेषु?त्र) तुल्यं स्वर्गारोग्यापवर्गार्थेषु शास्त्रेषु ।

*Jaya on Kāmaśāstra*

(Edn. Kashi Skt. Series, No. 29, 1929)

यदपि कामशास्त्रविदां केषाञ्चित् व्यवहाराकौशलं तत् तेषामेव दोषः, न शास्त्रस्य । .... प्रतिपत्तृदोषाच्च शास्त्रानर्थक्यं सर्वत्र तुल्यम् । न हि चिकित्सा-द्यर्थेषु शास्त्रेषु सर्वे तद्विदः पथ्याहारादिकं सेवन्ते, तस्मात् तदर्थिनो-ये

न सर्वे तद्विदः धर्माधर्मसेवापरिहारयोः भक्तिश्रद्धान्विताः, तेऽपि शास्त्रप्रयो-  
पध्यापध्याहारसेवासेवयोः रागादिहानौ जनहेतवः । (p. 2)

तत्त्वज्ञाने च अभिनिविशमाना  
दृश्यन्ते । ये तदर्थिनो भक्तिश्रद्दा-  
न्विताः, तेऽपि शास्त्राणां प्रयोजन-  
हेतवः । (p. 6)

शास्त्रं चेदं स्वपरमण्डलभेदाद्  
द्विधावस्थितं, तन्त्रम् आवापश्चेति ।....  
तन्त्रावापाभ्याम् असिद्धेऽर्थे उप-  
निषत्प्रयोग इत्यन्ते वचनम् । तदुभय-  
मपि तन्त्रावापान्तर्भूतमेव द्रष्टव्यम् ।  
(p. 7)

प्रकरणाधिकरणसङ्ख्यानमन्यनि-  
पेक्षार्थम् । (p. 7)

‘समासवाक्यं समुद्देशः’, ‘व्यास-  
वाक्यं निर्देशः’ इति । अस्य च  
प्रयोजनम् अध्येतॄणां विदितशास्त्रार्थ-  
प्रकरणानुपूर्वीकाणाम् असंमोहेन अध्य-  
यने प्रवृत्तिः । यथाभिलषितप्रकरणार्थ-  
प्रत्यवमर्शश्च प्रज्ञासमाना भविष्यति ।  
एवं च कृत्वोक्तम् व्यासेन, ‘इष्टं हि  
विदुषां लोके समासव्यासभाषणम्’,  
इति । (p. 6)

शास्त्रं चेदं तन्त्रम् आवापश्चेति  
द्विधा स्थितम् । .....  
औपनिषदिकं तु तन्त्रावापाभ्याम्  
असिद्धे व्याप्रियत इत्यन्ते वक्ष्यति ।  
तदुभयमपि तन्त्रावापान्तर्गतमेव तदङ्ग-  
त्वात् । (p. 9)

प्रकरणाधिकरणसङ्ख्यानमन्यनि-  
पेक्षार्थम् । (pp. 9-10)

‘इष्टं हि विदुषां लोके समास-  
व्यासभाषणम्’ ।....सङ्क्षेपविस्तराभ्यां  
शास्त्रस्य मनसि धारणमिष्टम् ।  
प्रज्ञातप्रकरणार्थक्रमत्वाद् असंमोहः  
यथाभिलषित-प्रकरणार्थ-प्रत्यवमर्शश्च  
स्यात् । (p. 10)

The legends of kings who had perished from excessive passion occur more or less in similar words in the *Jaya* on the *Arthasāstra* and in the *Jaya* on the *Kāmandaka*. Those of Dāṇḍakya Bhoja and Aila Purūravas among them, are found in the *Jaya* on *Kāmasāstra* also. Both the *Jaya* on *Arthasāstra* and the *Jaya* on *Kāmasāstra* quote in a similar context the stanzas, “ग्रहणयनवदुसमेतम्”<sup>1</sup> and ‘अजीर्णे भुज्यते

1. *Artha-Jaya*, p. 39, and *Kāma-Jaya*, p. 35.



यश्च<sup>1</sup>. The manuscripts of *Jaya* on *Kāmasāstra* do not reveal the name or the author; Aufrecht however mentions in his *Catalogus*, p. 256 a commentary on the *Kāmasāstra* of Vātsyāyana by Śaṅkarācārya (cf. *Indian Literature* by Weber, note on p. 267).

The *Jaya* on the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* (hereafter referred to as *Bhaṭṭi*) is quoted as authority in the *Amarasikāsarvasva*, *Durghaṭavṛtti* (1175 A.D.), the *Nānārthārṇava* of Keśava-svāmin (1200 A.D.) and in later works but none of them mentions the name of the author. The *Dhātuvṛtti* of Mādhavācārya (1380 A.D.) quotes a passage from a commentary on *Bhaṭṭikāvya* by one Śrīkarācārya in support of the view that the causal of the root 'grah' (to take hold of) does not govern double accusative. cf.

“तथा श्रीकराचार्यस्याप्यनभिमतम् उपादानार्थस्य द्विकर्मकत्वम् ।  
‘अजिग्रहत्तं जनकः’ (II. 42) इति भट्टिश्लोकं विवृण्वन् यदाह—तद् धनुः  
तं रामं जनकोऽजिग्रहद् बोधितवान्—अनेन धनुषा त्रिपुरं दग्धमिति ।  
ग्रहेश्च बुद्धयर्थत्वाद् ‘गतिबुद्धि’ इत्यादिना रामस्य कर्मसंज्ञा, धनुषस्तु  
‘कर्तुरीप्सिततमम्’ इति ग्रहिः द्विकर्मकः । उपादानार्थत्वे तु ग्रहिर्गत्यादिभ्वेकोऽपि  
न भवतीति कथं तमिति” । (Mysore Edn., p. 96). The words  
ascribed to Śrīkarācārya in the above quotation agrees with  
the text of the *Jaya* on *Bhaṭṭi* in the relevant context:

“तद् धनुः तं रामं जनकः अजिग्रहद् बोधितवान्—अनेन धनुषा  
त्रिपुरं दग्धम् इति.....ग्रहेश्च बुद्धयर्थत्वाद् ‘गतिबुद्धि’ इत्यादिना रामस्य  
कर्मसंज्ञा” । (II. 42, N. S. Press edn., p. 35). From these two  
citations, it appears that the author of the *Jaya* on *Bhaṭṭi*  
is one Śrīkarācārya. But Aufrecht mentions a com-  
mentary on *Bhaṭṭi* by Śaṅkarācārya as quoted in the  
*Dhātuvṛtti* of Mādhava (C.C. I. 395), and it is certain  
therefore that there was a reference to a commentary by  
Śaṅkarācārya on *Bhaṭṭi* in the manuscript of *Dhātuvṛtti*  
consulted by Aufrecht. The latter reading is confirmed by  
a palmleaf manuscript of the *Bhaṭṭi-Jaya* in the Trivandrum  
Palace Library which begins with the stanzas:

1. *Artha-Jaya*, p. 64, and *Kāma-Jaya*, p. 42.

स्वाख्यानाढ्यो विचित्राक्षरललितपदः संगृहीतार्थराशिः  
 शुद्दालंकारहारी सकलगुणनिधिर्निर्जिताशेषदोषः ।  
 विद्वत्प्रीतिप्रदेयो महितहरिभयः सर्वलक्ष्यानुगामी  
 शश्वल्लोकप्रसिद्धो नृपतिरिव महान् काव्यबन्धश्चकास्ति ॥  
 संपन्ना सकलेन लक्षणगुणेनोद्दीपितालंकृति-  
 र्युक्तीर्यानुगतप्रसन्नमधुराभिप्रायसंवादिनी ।  
 श्रीमच्छंकरपूज्यपादयतिना टीका निबद्धा स्वयं  
 तस्यैषा जयमङ्गलेति गदिता कान्तेव भाष्यद्भुता ॥  
 प्रणिपत्य सकलत्रेदिनमतिदुस्तरमर्तृकाव्यसलिलनिधेः ।  
 जयमङ्गलेति नाम्ना नौकेव विरच्यते टीका ॥

Its ending colophon runs thus: इति सत्कविचूडामणिगोविन्दस्वामिसूनु-  
 हरिस्वामिविरचिन-महाकाव्य-टीकायां भगवच्छंकरपरमहंसपरिव्राजकनिगदितायां  
 जयमङ्गलायां तिङन्तकाण्डे लुङ्बिलसितं नाम नवमः परिच्छेदः । काव्यस्य  
 अयोध्याप्रत्यागमनं नाम द्वाविंशः सर्गः ॥

जटीश्वरो जयदेवो जयमङ्गल इत्यपि ।  
 यस्य ख्यातिस्त्रिधा लोके टीका तेन कृता त्वियम् ॥

The excerpts given above make it clear that the author of *Jaya on Bhaṭṭi* was one Śaṅkarapūjyapādayati, also called Śaṅkarācārya, and that he came to be called Jaṭiśvara, Jayadeva and Jayamaṅgala. But only the last name which is the name of his commentary has survived. The ending colophon occurring in the N. S. Press edition of the *Jaya on Bhaṭṭi* adds that the author wrote commentaries on many śāstras (*aṅkaśāstra-vyākhyānakṛt*).

The *Jaya on the Sāṅkhyakārikā* is edited<sup>1</sup> from two manuscripts from Malabar and the closing colophon ascribes the work to Śaṅkarācārya who is described as '*paramahaṁsa parivrājaka*' and as a disciple of Govinda Bhagavatpāda<sup>2</sup>.

1. *Calcutta Oriental Series* No. 19.

2. इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्य-श्रीगोविन्दभगवत्पूज्यपादशिष्येण श्रीशङ्कर-  
 भगवता कृता साङ्ख्यसप्ततिटीका समाप्ता ।

Prof. Hiriyanṇa<sup>1</sup> and S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri<sup>2</sup> consider this commentary to be older than the *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* of Vācaspati Miśra (840 A.D.).

All the five commentaries show erudition in grammar and contain several allusions of interest and value claiming high antiquity. The *Jaya* on *Bhaṭṭi* says that, of the three wives of Daśaratha, Kausalyā and Kaikeyī were of the Kṣatriya caste and Sumitrā was born of parents through intermarriage and was their *paricūrikā*. They parted in her favour a portion each from their share of the oblation of rice that made them all conceive.<sup>3</sup> None of these *Jayamaṅgalās* have been critically edited and it cannot be said that the texts in them have come down to us without accretion or adulteration in the course of transmission through centuries. The *Jaya* on *Kāmandaka* mentions at one place Puṣkara as having defeated his brother Nala in gambling<sup>4</sup> and at another Jayasena (more properly Jayatsena) defeating his brother Nala.<sup>5</sup> *Kauṭalya* refers to Jayatsena as a winner in gambling and Nala as a loser and from this H. Jacobi argues<sup>6</sup> that the original name of Nala's brother was Jayatsena and that it was changed into Puṣkara in a later version of Nala story in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Jaya* on *Kāmandaka* strengthens the argument.

To sum up, there are parallels and agreements in the five commentaries and they are more striking in the *Arthaśāstra*

1. Cf. JOR III. 107-112.

2. Cf. *Sāṅkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa*, University of Madras 1935, p. 97.

3. कौसल्या कैकेयी च क्षत्रिये, सुमित्रा तु वर्णसङ्करजा..... तत्र कौसल्या कैकेयी च एकैकं पिण्डं प्राशितवत्यौ, ताभ्यां च आवयोः परिचारिकेति पिण्डभागद्वयं दत्तम् सुमित्रा प्राशितवती । (I. 13).

4. नलो राजा सह भ्रात्रा पुष्करनाम्ना अक्षैर्दीव्यन् सर्वे राज्यमपहारितवान् । (I. 56).

5. नलश्च राजा द्यूतेन हृते राज्ये भ्रात्रा जय [से? से]नेन धर्मदारान् दमयन्तीं वने त्यक्त्वा परकर्मकरोऽभवत् । (XV. 51).

6. IA LIII (1924) 144.

and the *Kāmandaka* commentaries. The other three are on different subjects, viz., *Kāmaśāstra*, *Śāstra-kāvya* on Vyākaraṇa and *Sāṅkhya*, wherein we cannot expect very perceptible parallels. Even if this may not form conclusive evidence to the identity of authorship of all these commentaries, surely it points to such a conclusion.

In the edition of *Arthaśāstra* *Jaya* that follows, for facilitating reference to the Mysore (M), second edition, and Trivandrum (T) edition of the text, the page numbers of these two editions are given in brackets before the first word commented from the respective pages.

In editing this important work, I am indebted to Dr. V. Raghavan for giving me facilities for bringing it out as a publication of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute. I am thankful to him also for valuable suggestions in the course of its publication. In seeing this work through the press, I have been helped by Sri K. V. Sarma and to him also my thanks are due. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the help I have received from the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, in making available to me for consultation their transcript of *Jayamaṅgalā* on the *Arthaśāstra*.

MADRAS, }  
25-4-1958. }

G. HARIHARA SASTRI